UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,644	12/29/2003	Guy Pardon	FREI.P-048-DV-P1801US/DIV	1643

68392 7590 01/26/2009
Oppedahl Patent Law Firm LLC - Frei
P.O. Box 4850
Frisco, CO 80443-4850

EXAMINER	
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/26/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket-oppedahl@oppedahl.com
office-mail@frei-patent.ch

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/707,644	PARDON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 October 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *6-18, 20 and 23-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *6-18, 20 and 23-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 7 October 2008.

2. Claims 6-18, 20 and 23-37 are pending in this application. Claims 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 18 and 23 are independent. In the Amendment filed 7 October 2008, claims 6, 9, 12, 18 and 23 are amended. This action is made Final.

3. The prior art rejections of claims 6-18, 20 and 23-37 have been maintained.

Claim Objections

4. The objections to claims 9, 13 and 14 have been withdrawn. However, it is noted that claim 9 has been amended to state a method, where as the claim previously stated a system. The claim does not contain the proper underlining and strikethrough of the terms.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. The rejections of Claims 6, 7, 12-14, 18, 19 and 23-37 under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent

granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No 6,076,078 to Camp et al (hereafter Camp).

Referring to claim 12, Camp discloses a distributed system using a two-phase commit protocol, said system characterized as a composite system comprising at least one computer processor (see abstract), the system comprising

a plurality of processes; each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective service defined by that interface (see Fig 2);

each or any two-phase commit message exchange between processes also carrying information about the actual work being committed [token] (see column 6, lines 25-40; Fig 3; column 8, lines 60-67 and column 11, lines 45-56).

Referring to claim 13, Camp discloses the system of claim 12, such information being logged for recoverability in the event of a crash, such information being used for assistance at any time before, during or after global commitment (see column 9, lines 52-57).

Referring to claim 14, Camp discloses the system of claim 12 or 13, wherein any globalCommit requires a registration [archive], and wherein the registration for a globalCommit also carries information about the actual work being committed [token] (see column 7, lines 7-16).

Referring to claim 15, Camp discloses a method for use in a distributed system, said system characterized as a composite system, the system comprising a plurality of processes; each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective service defined by that interface (see Fig 2), the method comprising the step of: for each or any globalCommit message exchange between processes also carrying information about the actual work being committed [token] (see column 6, lines 25-40 and column 11, lines 45-56).

Referring to claim 16, Camp discloses the method of claim 15 further cg the step of logging for recoverability in the event of a crash, such information being used for assistance at any time before, during or after global commitment (see column 9, lines 52-57).

Referring to claim 17, Camp discloses the method of claim 15 or 16 further comprising the step of propagating a registration [archive] for a global commit, and wherein the registration for a globalCommit also carries information about the actual work being committed [token] (see column 7, lines 7-16).

8. Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No 6,457,065 to Rich et al (hereafter Rich).

Referring to claim 18, Rich discloses a distributed system, said system characterized as a composite system (see abstract), the system comprising

a plurality of processes; each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective transactional service defined by that interface (see column 10, lines 1-41);

wherein a root transactional invocation or, alternatively, a root's human user is allowed to dynamically set its or his concurrency preferences for an entire transactional invocation; wherein the root invocation propagates the concurrency preferences with each or any child invocation it makes in order to provide improved customization; wherein the propagated concurrency preferences at any level in the root invocation's invocation hierarchy specify the extent to which shared resource access is desired or allowed or denied among descendant transactional invocations of the root invocation or user and other, concurrent transactional invocations who are also descendants of the same root (see column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 18).

Referring to claim 20, Rich discloses the system of claim 19 wherein each invocation propagates the concurrency preferences as it has received them from the root invocation (see column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 6-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,457,065 to Rich et al (hereafter Rich) in view of US Patent No 6,272,515 to Fouquet (hereafter Fouquet).

Referring to claim 6, Rich discloses a data management system, said system characterized as a composite system comprising at least one processor (see abstract), the system comprising

a plurality of processes; each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective service defined by that interface (see column 10, lines 1-41);

a first invocation of the at least one respective service by a transaction resulting in the creation of a first transaction [Child Tx 411] local to the process [Node_1 401] thereof, the first local transaction being a child of the invoking transaction [Top-level Tx 410] and being parent of any transaction triggered by invocation of a service of another process [Child Tx 413] (see column 9, lines 41-67 and Fig 4A);

a second invocation of the at least one respective service by a transaction resulting in the creation of a second transaction [child Tx 412] local to the process [Node_1 401] thereof, the second local transaction being a child of the invoking transaction [Top-level Tx 410] and being parent of any transaction triggered by invocation of a service of another process [Child Tx 415] (see column 9, lines 41-67);

each process further characterized in that each transaction local thereto is independently handled at the process (see column 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14);

each process making scheduling and recovery decisions independent of any centralized component (see column 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14).

However, Rich fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of each process characterized in that if the first transaction and the second transaction conflict but are both children of a same invoking transaction, then the first transaction and the second transaction are not executed concurrently. Fouquet discloses scheduling distributed transactions (see abstract), including the further limitation of each process characterized in that if the first transaction and the second transaction conflict but are both children of a same invoking transaction, then the first transaction and the second transaction are not executed concurrently (see column 2, line 62 – column 3, line 7).

It would have been obvious to utilize the step of determining whether or not to process sibling transactions as disclosed by Fouquet with the distributed transactions of Rich. One would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for conflicts of execution between operations of different transactions (Fouquet: see column 1, lines 42-49).

Referring to claim 7, the combination of Rich and Fouquet (hereafter Rich/Fouquet) discloses the system of claim 6 wherein a root transaction is able to dynamically set concurrency preferences for a resulting distributed transaction, based on client needs, wherein the concurrency preferences specify the extent to which shared resource access is desired or allowed or denied among descendant transaction invocations of the root invocation or user and other, concurrent transaction invocations

who are also descendants of the same root (Rich: see column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 18).

Referring to claim 8, Rich discloses a method for use with a data management system, said system characterized as a composite system comprising at least one processor (see abstract), the system comprising

a plurality of processes; each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective transactional service defined by that interface (see column 10, lines 1-41);

invocation of the at least one respective transactional service by a thread [query] of the invoking transaction and being parent of any transaction triggered by invocation of a transactional service of another process (see column 9, lines 41-67; column 17, lines 47-57; and Fig 4A);

each process further characterized in that each transaction local thereto is independently handled at the process (see column 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14);

each process making scheduling and recovery decisions independent of any centralized component triggered by invocation of a transactional service of another process, each process further characterized in that each transaction local thereto is independently handled at the process, each process making scheduling and recovery decisions independent of any centralized component (see column 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14).

However, Rich fails to disclose the further limitation of the method. Fouquet discloses scheduling distributed transactions (see abstract), including the further limitation of the method comprising the steps of:

propagating from a first process to a second process a message indicative of a globalCommit operation with respect to a root transaction, said message also indicative of a number [counter] or identifying list of transactional invocations which the first process has made to the second process on behalf of the root transaction (see column 3, lines 31-36);

within the second process, comparing the number or list indicated in the message with a count or list within the second process of the number or list of transactional invocations which have been made on behalf of the root transaction (see column 3, lines 45-52);

in the event the comparison yields a non-match, aborting the transaction (see column 3, lines 45-52).

It would have been obvious to utilize the step of determining whether to abort the transaction as disclosed by Fouquet with the distributed transactions of Rich. One would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for conflicts of execution between operations of different transactions (Fouquet: see column 1, lines 42-49).

Referring to claim 9, Rich/Fouquet discloses the system of claim 8, wherein each process is executed using Java (see column 7, lines 25-29).

Referring to claim 10, Rich discloses a method for use with a data management system, said system characterized as a composite system (see abstract), the system

comprising a plurality of processes, each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective service defined by that interface (see column 10, lines 1-41), invocation of the at least one respective service by a transaction resulting in the creation of a transaction local to the process thereof, the local transaction being a child of the invoking transaction and being parent of any transaction triggered by invocation of a service of another process (see column 9, lines 41-67; column 17, lines 47-57; and Fig 4A), each process further characterized in that each transaction local thereto is independently handled at the process, each process making scheduling and recovery decisions independent of any centralized component (see column 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14).

However, Rich fails to disclose the further limitation of the method. Fouquet discloses scheduling distributed transactions (see abstract), including the further limitation of the method comprising the steps of:

propagating from a first process to a second process a message indicative of a globalCommit operation with respect to a root transaction, said message also indicative of a number [counter] or identifying list of invocations which the first process has made to the second process on behalf of the root transaction (see column 3, lines 31-36);

within the second process, comparing the number or list indicated in the message with a count or list within the second process of the number or list of invocations which have been made on behalf of the root transaction (see column 3, lines 45-52);

in the event the comparison yields a match, proceeding with the globalCommit (see column 3, lines 45-52).

It would have been obvious to utilize the step of determining whether to abort the transaction as disclosed by Fouquet with the distributed transactions of Rich. One would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for conflicts of execution between operations of different transactions (Fouquet: see column 1, lines 42-49).

Referring to claim 11, Rich discloses a method for use with a data management system, said system characterized as a composite system (see abstract), the system comprising a plurality of processes, each process having an interface and implementing at least one respective service defined by that interface (see column 10, lines 1-41), invocation of the at least one respective service by a transaction resulting in the creation of a transaction local to the process thereof, the local transaction being a child of the invoking transaction and being parent of any transaction triggered by invocation of a service of another process (see column 9, lines 41-67; column 17, lines 47-57; and Fig 4A), each process further characterized in that each transaction local thereto is independently handled at the process, each process making scheduling and recovery decisions independent of any centralized component (see column 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14).

However, Rich fails to disclose the further limitation of the method. Fouquet discloses scheduling distributed transactions (see abstract), including the further limitation of the method comprising the steps of:

propagating from a first process to a second process a message indicative of a globalCommit operation with respect to a root transaction, said message also indicative of a number [counter] or identifying list of invocations which the first process has made to the second process on behalf of the root transaction (see column 3, lines 31-36);

within the second process, comparing the number or list indicated in the message with a count or list within the second process of the number or list of invocations which have been made on behalf of the root transaction (see column 3, lines 45-52);

in the event the comparison yields a non-match, aborting the transaction (see column 3, lines 45-52).

It would have been obvious to utilize the step of determining whether to abort the transaction as disclosed by Fouquet with the distributed transactions of Rich. One would have been motivated to do so in order to allow for conflicts of execution between operations of different transactions (Fouquet: see column 1, lines 42-49).

11. Claims 23-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US No 6,457,065 to Rich et al in view of US Patent No 6,233,585 to Gupta et al (hereafter Gupta).

Referring to claim 23, Rich et al disclose a computerized data management system, referred to as transactional service, comprising:

one or more operations that can be invoked by remote clients; Some or all such remote clients having one or more associated transaction contexts (see column 10, lines 1-41).

However, Rich fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations. Gupta et al discloses a transaction system (see abstract), including the further limitations of an invocation of the service by a remote client also containing partial or complete information indicating or containing said client's transaction context or contexts (see column 8, lines 10-51); an invocation of the service, by a remote client, of an operation leading to a new transaction different from, but possibly related to, any existing client transaction (see column 5, lines 16-19); such an operation-level transaction being committed before the client transaction context is terminated before globalCommit notification (see column 12, lines 28-57); the transactional service locally maintaining an undo operation for such a committed operation (see column 6, lines 12-20); and a failing or failed remote client transaction context leading to the execution of the locally maintained of the undo operations of the corresponding committed invocations in the transactional service (see column 7, lines 42-46) in order to provide recoverability.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the feature of undo operations as disclosed by Gupta et al with the management system of Rich. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide recoverability.

Referring to claim 24, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where some or all undo operations are executed in an order that is the reverse of an order of their

original counterparts (Gupta et al: see column 9, line 66 – column 10, line 2 – rollback is considered to represent undo; first-in-last-out is considered to represent reverse order).

Referring to claim 25, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where in addition the undo operations are chosen or defined in the same system as the one where corresponding normal operations were executed (Gupta et al: see column 12, lines 46-56).

Referring to claim 26, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where some or all undo operations are unknown to the transactional context of a remote client (Gupta et al: see column 12, lines 11-12).

Referring to claim 27, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where some or all undo operations are executed after a timeout and independent of whether the client's transaction context outcome requires such undo (Gupta et al: see column 12, lines 11-12).

Referring to claim 28, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 wherein an undo operation with respect to an original operation, where an undo operation's effects are confined to data managed by the service on which the undo operation is maintained, even if the respective original operation involved other services (Gupta et al: see column 12, lines 45-56).

Referring to claim 29, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where the service keeps locks on transactions to ensure that undo operations can be executed correctly (Gupta et al: see column 9, lines 19-21).

Referring to claim 30, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where client context-related information is also part of any global commit message exchanges (Gupta et al: see column 10, lines 4-7).

Referring to claim 31, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where client context information includes application-specific data (Gupta et al: see column 10, lines 4-7 – the context relates to the transaction which is considered to be application-specific).

Referring to claim 32, Rich/Gupta discloses system of claim 31 where all or part of the context information is logged, by storing on persistent storage, and retrievable by a human. Administrator (Gupta et al: see column 8, lines 11-14).

Referring to claim 33, Rich/Gupta discloses system of claim 23 where the service accepts messages indicative of which previously committed operations have to be undone (Gupta et al: see column 11, lines 1-7).

Referring to claim 34, Rich/Gupta discloses system of claim 23 where the service accepts messages indicative of which previously committed operations do not have to be undone (Gupta et al: see column 11, lines 1-7).

Referring to claim 35, Rich/Gupta discloses the system of claim 23 where some or all invocations are message-based or asynchronous (Gupta et al: see column 3, lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 36, Rich/Gupta discloses system of claim 23 where some or all invocations are synchronous (Gupta et al: see column 3, lines 1-4).

Referring to claim 37, Rich/Gupta discloses system of claim 23 where the client can request the undo executions of its invocations at the service while still allowing globalCommit (Gupta et al: see column 12, lines 28-56).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed in regards to the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 16, the Applicant states that "Because the entire content of Foquet was maintained in secrecy within the USPTO pursuant to 37 CFR section 1.14, until August 7, 2001, the Applicant's attorney questions the assertion made in the Office Action." The Applicant also states this argument in regards with Rich et al.

The examiner points out that both of these references qualify as prior art under 102(e). It is not a requirement for art that qualifies as prior art under 102(e) to be published or what the Applicant is referring to as being publicly known. It is merely only a requirement that the US applications have been filed before the date the current application was filed. Both US Patents meet this requirement. See MPEP 706.02(f)(1)[R-5] for further information.

14. Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 17 of the Remarks in regards to claim 6, the applicants argues that "Rich thus discloses that it is objects that have independent representations and that can be viewed separately by different transactions. It is not disclosed that each transaction local to a process is

independently handled at the process makes scheduling and recovery decision independent of any centralized component."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner interprets that statements each transaction has an independent view of an object and the actions performed on transactions are isolated as meeting the requirements of the limitation which states "each transaction local thereto is independently handled at the process." Colum' 10, lines 31-41 and column 13, lines 8-14 were cited for stating the limitations of scheduling and recovery.

The Applicant continues to argue that the transactions disclosed in Fouquet are not child transactions of the same parent. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As stated in column 4, lines 45-51, these transactions are distributed transactions. It is well-know that distributed transactions come from an initial parent transaction.

15. In regards to Applicant's arguments on page 19 of the Remarks concerning the rejections of claims 8 and 10, counter of Fouquet is considered to meet these limitations since it keeps track of the transactions and conflicting transactions.

16. In regards to applicants' arguments concerning claim 12 on page 14, the examiner respectfully disagrees that Camp fails to disclose the message carrying any information about the work being committed. As pointed out in the rejection, this is the purpose of the token. Therefore, the rejections of claims 15-17 are maintained for the same reasons.

17. In regards to applicants' arguments concerning claim 18, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Rich deals with propagating preferences that effect how the

transactions are executed. The user chooses to either commit [allow access] or discard [deny access]. This relates to more than just what values are propagated. The concepts of allowing or not allowing is considered to represent the extent to which the resource is allowed or denied. Claim 20 is maintained for the reasons stated above.

18. In regards to applicants' arguments concerning claim 6, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Rich discloses that the work is transparently maintained. In order for the work to be transparently maintained, each transaction would have to be independently maintained. Furthermore, in column 14, lines 8-14, Rich states "each transaction and subtransaction is able to see a completely independent representation of the replicated object that is isolated from any other transaction and subtransaction. In this manner, actions performed relative to a replicated object can be isolated to the transaction or subtransaction performing the actions." Since the transactions are completely independent, the processes are considered to be capable of making their own decisions.

19. Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 21 of the Remarks, the rejections of claims 10-11 have been maintained for the reasons stated above.

20. Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 21 concerning the combination of Rich and Gupta have been maintained for the reasons stated above.

21. Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 22 of the Remarks referring to the breadth of interpretation of claims 23-27, the examiner points out that if a transaction is local to one process then it would be considered remote to another process.

Conclusion

22. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Luke S. Wassum/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

16 January 2009
/kml/